

Examiner-Initiated Interview Summary	Application No.	Applicant(s)
	10/740,033	CERNY ET AL.
	Examiner	Art Unit
	Phallaka Kik	2825

All Participants:

Status of Application: pending

(1) Phallaka Kik.

(3) _____.

(2) Johnathan T. Kaplan (Reg. No. 38,935).

(4) _____.

Date of Interview: 8 February 2006

Time: 11 AM

Type of Interview:

Telephonic
 Video Conference
 Personal (Copy given to: Applicant Applicant's representative)

Exhibit Shown or Demonstrated: Yes No

If Yes, provide a brief description:

Part I.

Rejection(s) discussed:

None

Claims discussed:

1-23

Prior art documents discussed:

None

Part II.

SUBSTANCE OF INTERVIEW DESCRIBING THE GENERAL NATURE OF WHAT WAS DISCUSSED:

See Continuation Sheet

Part III.

It is not necessary for applicant to provide a separate record of the substance of the interview, since the interview directly resulted in the allowance of the application. The examiner will provide a written summary of the substance of the interview in the Notice of Allowability.
 It is not necessary for applicant to provide a separate record of the substance of the interview, since the interview did not result in resolution of all issues. A brief summary by the examiner appears in Part II above.

(Examiner/SPE Signature)

(Applicant/Applicant's Representative Signature – if appropriate)

Continuation of Substance of Interview including description of the general nature of what was discussed: On January 20, 2006, in response to the Examiner's earlier message on Applicant's answering machine, indicating that the claims are subjected to a requirement restriction, wherein group I invention, claims 1,3-4,6,20,22 is drawn to electromagnetic waveform/method/computer program for performing formal verification of a representation of an electronic design of an IC, classified in class 716, subclass 5 and group II invention, claims 2,5,7-19,21,23, is drawn to electromagnetic waveform/method/computer program for performing simulation verification involving conversion steps, classified in class 716, subclass 3, wherein the inventions are related to each other as being subcombinations usable together but could have separate utilities, and would further require separate searches; Applicant's Representative elected group II invention with traverse.

On February 8, 2006, in response to the Examiner's earlier indication on 2/2/2006, that the elected claims are allowable except for minor informalities to claims 2,7,21 and minor informalities to the specification, including the abstract, Applicant's Representative authorizes the Examiner to amend the claims and the specification, including the abstract as given in the attached Examiner's Amendment. In addition, since the non-elected claims 1,3-4,6,20,22 were orally elected with traverse, Applicant's Representative also authorizes the Examiner to cancel these claims as given in the attached Examiner's Amendment so that the application can be passed to issue.